



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,811	10/11/2005	Johannes Baier	DE 030105	5539
24737	7590	03/09/2007	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			SANEI, HANA ASMAT	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2879	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/09/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/552,811	BAIER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hana A. Sanei	2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 October 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The Amendment, filed on 12/11/06, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the instant application.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-4, 6, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Born et al (US 6137230).

Regarding Claim 1, Born teaches a filling (11, see at least Fig.1) comprising only (discharge space is Hg-free and the ionizable filling further comprises Zn, Col. 1, lines 50-54), a halogen (Nal, TlI, or Re-iodide, Col. 2, lines 19-26) and a rare gas (Xe, Col. 2, line 14).

Regarding Claim 2, Born teaches a filling (11, see at least Fig.1) comprising only zinc (discharge space is Hg-free and the ionizable filling further comprises Zn, Col. 1,

lines 50-54), iodine (Nal, TII, or Re-iodide, Col. 2, lines 19-26) and a rare gas (Xe, Col. 2, line 14).

Regarding Claim 3, Born teaches that an overall amount of the halogen is about 1 and 30 $\mu\text{mol}/\text{cm}^3$ (any one of Nal, TII, RE-I in units of $\mu\text{mol}/\text{cm}^3$, Col. 2, lines 19-26), the overall amount zinc is more than 1 $\mu\text{mol}/\text{cm}^3$ (4 $\mu\text{mol}/\text{cm}^3$, Col. 2, lines 29-31), and the zinc/halogen molar ratio is greater than 1 (Col. 2, lines 19-26, Col. 2, lines 29-31).

Regarding Claim 4, Born teaches that the zinc/atomic halogen molar ratio is greater than 1 (Col. 2, lines 19-26, Col. 2, lines 29-31).

Regarding Claim 6, Born teaches that a coupling-in of energy takes place by means of metal electrodes (4, 5).

Regarding Claim 8, Born teaches a lamp tube consists of quartz, aluminum oxide, or yttrium-aluminum garnet (ceramic wall, Col. 2, lines 49-50).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Born et al (US 6137230) in view of Hadeishi et al (US 4941743).

Regarding Claim Born, Born teaches the invention set forth above (see rejection in Claim 1 above). Born fails to teach that a in-coupling of energy takes place by means without electrodes in the microwave range.

In the same field of endeavor of discharge lamps, Hadeishi teaches that the discharge lamp is in the microwave range (Col. 3, lines 36-38) provided with (electrodes 32, 34; Fig. 1) or without electrodes (EDL, Col. 1, lines 6-16; Col. 1, lines 30-34), thus exemplifying recognized equivalent materials of the lamp in the art. Hadeishi teaches the suitability of using a discharge lamp being provided with or without electrodes in order to ensure high stability and long life (Col. 1, lines 30-34). Hadeishi further teaches the likes of a lamp that comprises two electrodes 32, 34 having the characteristics of an electrodeless discharge lamp, thereby integrating the concepts of an electrodeless lamp with that of a discharge lamp that already occupies two opposing electrodes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the discharge lamp of Born as electrodeless instead of with two opposing electrodes, since the selection of any of these known equivalents would be considered within the level of ordinary skill in the art as evidenced by Hadeishi's teaching.

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Born et al (US 6137230) in view of Caruso et al (US 4742268).

Regarding Claim 7, Born teaches the invention set forth above (see rejection in Claim 1 above). Born fails to teach the addition of calcium halide, with the overall amount of calcium being at least 1 nmol/cm³.

In the same field of endeavor, Caruso teaches a metal halide lamp comprising a calcium halide (CaI_2 , Col. 4, lines 43-51), with the overall amount of calcium being at least 1 nmol/cm³ (5.48 $\mu\text{mol}/\text{cm}^3$) for the purposes of ensuring low minimum perceptible color differences and a high color preference index (Col. 4, lines 60-64). Caruso teaches the benefit of an addition of calcium by teaching the incremental increase of the calcium iodide concentration tested in a controlled experiment (see at least Table 1). Filling compositions Additive A and Additive B are compared, their difference lying in the amount of calcium iodide increases while the composition of the fill remainder is held constant. Caruso does this to exhibit the benefits demonstrated when the amount of calcium iodide is increased from 5.5 mg to 6.6 mg of CaI_2 .

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add the calcium iodide, as disclosed by Caruso, in the discharge lamp of Born in order to/for providing ensure low minimum perceptible color differences and a high color preference index.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 12/11/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's arguments that Born et al fails to teach each and every limitation of Claim 1, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

A halide is a binary compound formed of a halogen and a less electronegative element thereof. That applicant included in the claims, "a halogen," does not necessarily mandate that the ionizable filling be partly formed of a elemental diatomic

halogen, but rather that the halogen be a part of a binary system, such as NaI. Examiner suggests, for further clarity, modifying the language: "a halogen." Hence, in its current state, the claim language employed does not preclude NaI as a "halogen."

If applicant is intending to refer to compounds such as Br₂, I₂, Cl₂, F₂, then it is suggested to replace "halogen" with – **elemental** halogen – or – a halogen in its **elemental state** –. Furthermore, since Group 17 of the periodic table has a limited number of chemical elements, Examiner also suggest following the – **elemental** halogen – or a – halogen in its **elemental state** – with – comprising one of Br₂, I₂, Cl₂, F₂, and such.

The proposed modification to Claim 1, in its original and current state, will render a clear and concise claim with a solid description of what is provided in the ionizable filling.

For the reasons stated above, the rejection of the claims is deemed proper.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hana A. Sanei whose telephone number is (571) 272-8654. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Hana A. Sanei
Examiner



Joseph Williams
Primary Examiner